



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A NEW FRAGMENT OF BEN SIRA.

THE first find consisted merely of the fragment which forms now the lower portion of the page. It numbered all told three lines on each side. These lines correspond with chap. xx. 6, 7, 13 of the Greek. The rest was missing. The gap, numbering apparently six verses, opened up a vista of conjectures on the mode of writing, on the size of the leaf and other palaeographical topics. I indulged in them largely, giving free scope to fancy, until I discovered the missing portion, and much of my former work had to be recast. Meanwhile also, papers appearing in the last number of the *J. Q. R.* and of the *Revue des Études Juives* taught that other fragments belonging to the same book had been found elsewhere, viz. in Cambridge and Paris. In writing this I am not indulging in a description of futile attempts of reconstruction, but place on record the fact that any new discovery might and often does entirely upset results based upon conjecture. It applies to the whole text of Ben Sira with equal force, and the final word can then only be spoken, when the remaining portions will have come to light. The *variae lectiones* in the two recensions or groups of MSS. have in a similar manner thrown a new light on the marginal glosses, have set at rest doubts and hypotheses, and have still more complicated the question of authenticity. The present fragment will also not diminish these difficulties.

Before entering upon the minute study of the text itself, it is necessary to consider it from the purely palaeographical point of view, to describe the characteristic features, and to draw some conclusions as to the

probable date of this MS. Hitherto no attempt has been made to describe the other fragments from the palaeographical side, and Mr. Adler has attempted to determine the date of his MS. only from the paper on which it is written. Assuredly an insufficient guide for the fixing of the age of a MS. without any other corroborative evidence.

The size of this MS. is smaller than that of any other. It is well known that the smaller the leaves are the older they are, and precede in point of time the larger paper leaves. The length of a leaf seems to grow with its more recent date, especially in the case of leaves used in the making up of a book, destined to be folded in layers of four or more leaves. Fragments of a very old Haggadah for Pesah, with rudimentary illuminations, are of a similar small size and written on almost the same kind of thick yellow paper. The writing is in accordance with this supposed old age. Large and not clearly determined form of letters is a characteristic of such early writings. Noteworthy among the archaic form of Hebrew letters is the short form of the final "Nun," the peculiar "Shin," the long "Vav" at the end of the word; the long stroke at the left foot of the "Tau" and "'Ain" are similar proofs of early date. Another is afforded by the evident care with which the copyist has written the text exactly in twelve lines to the page and on an average four words to the line. They are uncials or square as in B and not cramped as in Codd. A and C (i. e. the fragment published by Mr. Israel Lévi in the *Revue des Études Juives*, vol. XL, 1900, p. 1 ff.), both written in a cursive hand. A is considered by Mr. Adler (*J. Q. R.*, p. 467) not later than 832. The new MS. follows on the whole the text as represented by Cod. B inasmuch as an attempt is made as far as possible to write no more than a hemistich to the line; so that two lines would correspond with one verse, written in Cod. B in one line across the whole page, with a blank space in the middle. The oldest Codices of the Bible are written in narrow columns, and later copies retain this division, especially in Psalms.

Proverbs, and Job, as long as possible. The running of one verse into the other is a sign of later age.

In all the known Codices of Ben Sira the end of the verses are marked by two dots (:). This new text differs; the end of the verse is marked by a single dot (.) and a blank space of two or three letters. The time when double dots were introduced has not yet been exactly determined. In my study of the Samaritan Biblical Scroll I have pointed out, that the oldest of these Scrolls contains already the double dot. But that would not make it earlier than the twelfth or the eleventh century. In the eighth century, however, it was declared illegal to introduce them into the Sacred Scroll of the Pentateuch. In order to be forbidden the practice must have existed and crept in. It may have been used first in profane literature. This would place the MS. with the verse-mark of one single dot not later than the eighth century. Old is also the practice of placing the dot high up, on a line with the upper portion of the letter, and not in the middle or at the bottom, as is done in modern times. In spite of it, however, this text cannot by any means be so old as the eighth century. The only guide in Hebrew palaeography, still in its infancy, is the comparison with dated MSS. of the Bible. The oldest, assigned to the middle of the ninth century, has no marks at the end of the verse. It appears in the Codex Petropolitanus of 916; but the small free space which separates in our MS. one verse from the other has entirely disappeared. On the other hand we miss there one very important characteristic, viz. the lengthened letters. It is well known that Hebrew words are not divided when they happen to be at the end of a line. In old Codices the device resorted to by the scribe was to fill the blank space with parts of letters or with the first two letters of the word fully written in the following line. Not before the eleventh century can any trace of the system be found, according to which some of the letters were lengthened, so as to fill up the line. Both MSS. A and C have a good

number of such lengthened letters, as the writing goes to the very edge of the line. The copyist of B, with ample space at his disposal, had no need to resort to the use of these letters. The new text has also lengthened letters, introduced by the copyist for the same reason, i. e. to fill up his line, although he was not sparing in blank space at the end of the verse. Finding in one instance that he had not sufficient room left for another word on the same line (fol. a, third line from the bottom) he lengthened the final "Mem" in the word הזכר. We do not meet with such letters in any Biblical MS. earlier than the eleventh century, and even if we should admit that such letters were first used in profane literature, before they were introduced into sacred texts (not the Scroll!) none of these MSS. of Ben Sira could be earlier than the end of the tenth century or the beginning of the eleventh; the oldest of them being this one, as it is more archaic than the others, and is the only one, except B, written in uncials or square type.

Turning now to the contents, it is at once apparent that we have in this leaf a further portion of the book of which two leaves have been found in Cambridge, and one in Paris, belonging to what I would call the "Abstract" or "Compendium of Ben Sira," apparently an epitome of the larger work. The place of this fragment has evidently been after the first leaf published by Mr. Schechter, as the author of this compilation follows generally the order of the chapters in Ben Sira, though this very fragment seems to offer an exception, indicating that he did not scruple to go farther afield to borrow some verses from a different chapter. As far as can be guessed he attempts to group together sentences and maxims on one and the same subject, avoiding repetition and reiteration, and he arranges them in the sequence in which they are found in the fuller text. Our text contains, according to the misleading numeration of the Greek version, the following verses: ch. xvii. 31-33; xix. 1-2; xx. 5-7; xxxvii. 19, 22, 24, 26; xx. 13, altogether thirteen verses, of which four are known

already, and in two recensions, whilst the rest appears for the first time, belonging to the chapters still missing.

It is a fortunate coincidence that the verses of chap. xxxvii are found here also. This is the third copy of one and the same passage found in the fragment of the British Museum and in that of Mr. Lévi. In these, however, the text is fuller, for the verses counted in the Greek as 20, 23, and 25 are found in C (Codex Lévi), and verses 20 and 25 BM (British Museum), 23 being added as a marginal gloss. Verse 21 is missing in all the three copies. They are, however, not found in the Hebrew in the same order as in the Greek. The order in the former is: C 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 24, 26, 27; and BM 19, 20, 22, 25, 24, 26. This confusion in the order of the verses is the more interesting, as the parallel passage in the Syriac shows a similar want of order. Verse 21 is missing in the Syriac and so is 25. The corruption of this passage in the Syriac is, however, more apparent than real. The counting of the Syriac verses is not to be relied upon. (Mr. Lévi took them to be identical with the Greek text, and he has therefore compared verses which have nothing whatsoever to do one with the other.) In the London Polyglott the numbering does not agree with Lagarde's. For our purpose we must needs ignore this artificial counting and divide the text as it stands before us in the best way possible. We must then no longer compare 19 or 22 with what is counted as such in Lagarde; but 19 with 22 (corrected as will be shown later on), G 22 with Syr. 23; G 24 with Syr. 24 and G 26 with Syr. 26. It must not be forgotten that ver. 25 does not exist in Syriac, as well as in this Hebrew fragment. The parallelism between the "Abstract" and the Syriac is now as perfect as can be wished. The confusion noticed in B and C is due to the same causes which have disarranged the order of the Syriac, viz. to the desire of completing the text by the assistance of other versions or MSS. from which other verses have been interpolated.

I have dealt with this point at some length, as it is an important one, and may help to determine the relation in which the "Abstract" stands to the fuller recension. The close agreement in the order and also in the form with the Syriac, such as we have it, precludes the possibility that the "Abstract" has been made from the fuller Hebrew recension, as represented by MSS. A, B, and C. It would be a miracle to find the author of the "Abstract" to have omitted exactly those verses that are missing in S, and miracles are excluded from purely literary work. It may be further asked whether these verses are in their proper place in the Greek and Syr. (xxxvii. 19 ff.). It is known to every one who has followed up the internal history of the text that transpositions have taken place. These verses are felt to be incongruous in ch. xxxvii. They stand in no connexion either with what precedes or with what follows; whilst in the Hebrew the connexion seems perfect. We must bear in mind that the compiler follows the original in a strictly chronological order, except in this one case. In the Paris MS. we have abstracts from ch. vi. 18—vii. 25, in the first leaf of Cambridge iv. 23—v. 13. In this fragment xvii. 31—xx. 13, and in the second leaf in Cambridge xxv. 8—xxvi. 19. (I do not mention the verses omitted, but only the starting and the last verse.) In the original from which the "Abstract" has been made these verses may and have assuredly formed part of ch. xx, filling up the gap here between verses 7 and 13. Ryssel also points out that in ch. xx, ver. 13 joins practically ver. 8.

The old Hebrew original, as far as the wording itself is concerned, cannot have been different from the full recension as recovered. The agreement is so close that no other text could have served as basis for the compiler. The portions found in this MS. which are identical with corresponding portions of the full recension have established this fact beyond doubt. The relation in which this text stands to the other versions will be discussed in the Notes.

It will be found that in some instances the text agrees with the Syriac, in other more rare occasions it agrees with the Greek. In this small fragment, in fact, verses 6 and 13 of ch. xx are missing in the Syriac. But with the actual state of these versions before us, it is more than rash to draw final conclusions either from the presence or from the absence of words and verses in one version or in the other; more decisive is the coincidence in the forms in which words and sentences have been preserved. Not one of these versions has come down to us in its primitive form, nor even in any reliable form. The changes and manipulations to which each one of them has been subjected have been manifold and varied; each has been corrected and interpolated from the other; Greek has been changed over and over again in the course of time; the hand of an Alexandrian author, well acquainted with the LXX, a Christian, and later editors, have modified the translation of Ben Sira; and the activity of the "Hexapla" revisers of the Greek text of the Bible did not stay their hands at Ecclesiasticus. The original from which the Syriac translation has been made was either corrupt or imperfect, and the Syriac text itself has not fared much better. It has seen many changes; alterations by Jewish and Christian hands, noticeable in the Greek, have not left the latter uninfluenced.

I do not wish to enter now into the discussion as to the authenticity of the Hebrew text. I must reserve that for a special study, begun with the first publication of Messrs. Neubauer and Cowley's text, and which is being amplified and completed in consequence of subsequent discoveries. I have no doubt that the Hebrew text now recovered is not the original Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus.

I am now publishing the text, with an interlinear Syriac version in square brackets, so as to facilitate the comparison between the two texts. Missing words and parts have been completed mostly with the assistance of *B* and *C*.



שֹׁמֵר • אֵל תִּשְׁמַח אֵל שָׁמַיִם
תִּעֲשֶׂה אֱשֶׁר פִּי שֹׁמֵר יוֹשֵׁן
אֵל תְּחִי זֹלֶל רֶסֶב וּמֵאוֹמֶה
אֵין בָּכִים • כּוֹשֵׁל זָאֵר
עֲשִׂיר וּכְחָה מַעֲשִׂים
וְרַעֲדִי יֵין וְנִשְׁוִים
יָזוּ לֵב וְנִפְשָׁה עֲזָה
עֲחִית בְּעִלִּית • יֵשׁ
וְנִחְשָׁה

כִּמְאֵס בְּרִים
יֵשׁ מַחְדִּישׁ מֵאֵין מַעֲשֶׂה
יֵשׁ מַחְדִּישׁ כִּי רֵאָה עִתִּי

xviii. 31 שונא · 32 אל תשמח אל שמי

[דסנאה: 32 לא תחדא בסונאא]

תענוג אשר פי שנים רישו ·

[דתפניקא · דלא חד תרין תהוא מסכין ·]

33 אל תהי זולל וסוכא ומאומ(ה)

(מסכ זו) (ופקק)

[לא תהוא רוי זולל כד מדם]

אין בכיס · xix. i פועל זאת

[בכיסך לית: פעלא רויא]

(לא י) עשיר ובוזה מעוטים

[לא נעתר]

(ית) ערער: 2 יין ונשים

[נארת מסכניתא: חמרא ואנתתא]

(יפ) חזו לב ונפש עזה

[מפחזין לבא · נפשא חציפא]

(ת) שחית בעליה · xx. 5 יש

[תובר מרה · אית]

(מחרי) ש ונחשב . . .

[דכד שתיק מתחשב חכימא]

יש נמאס בריב . . .

[ואית דמסתנא בסונאא דשועיתה]

6 יש מחריש מאין מענה

[.]

ויש מחריש כי ראה עת

[.]

7. xx. חכם מחריש עד עת

[ונברא חכימא נטר עדנא]

וכסיל לא ישמור עת · 19 xxxvii. יש

ועולא

[ונברא מרחא לא נטר עדנא: אית]

חכם לרבים נחכם ולנפשו

[חכימא דבכל ערן חכים]

הוא גואל · 22 יש חכם

[ומן כל איקר כלא נפשה: ואית חכימא]

לנפשו יחכם פרי דע(תו)

[דלנפשה חכים ופארא דעברוהי]

על גויתו · 24 חכם לנפש(ו)

[מן חזוא דאפוהי: ודחכים לנפשה]

ישבע תענוג וכל ר(ואיהו)

[נסבע תפניקא]

יאשרוהו · 26 חכם (עם?)

[ונשבחוה כלחון חזיוהי: חכימא דעמא]

(ינחל) כבוד ושמו (עומד)

[נארת איקרא ושמה קים]

(בחיי) עולם · 13 xx. חכם

[לחיא דלעלם:]

במעט דבר נפשו וטובת קמ

[.]

כסילים ישפוך חכמה

כבוד

[.]

חכם יחריש עד ערש
וכסיל לא ישמור עת
חכם לדביר נחכם ולנפשו
הוא גואל יש חכם
לנפשו יחכם פרי דע
עד איתו חכם לנפ
ישבע תעטג ומל
יאשרחו חכם ג
יחיד ושם

עולם חכם
במעט דבר נפשו נזכר
כסילים ישמור חכמה

TENTATIVE TRANSLATION.

xviii. 31. The enemy. 32. Take not pleasure in much cheer, the poverty (caused) thereby is double. 33. Be not a glutton and a drunkard, (when) there is nothing in the purse. xix. 1. One who acts thus shall not be rich, and he that contemneth small things will become destitute. 2. Wine and women defile the heart (mind), and a bold (impudent) soul destroys its master. xx. 5. There is one that keepeth silence, and is considered wise; there is one who is contemned by much (babbling). 6. There is one that keepeth silence, because there is no (or, he hath not an) answer; and some keepeth silence for he seeth the time. 7. A wise man keepeth silence until the time, and the fool will not regard (watch) time. xxxvii. 19. There is one that is wise to many but to himself he is defiled (useless). 22. There is one that is wise to himself, the fruit of his understanding is upon his body (countenance). 24. A wise man to himself shall be satisfied with pleasure (delight), and all that see him shall count him happy. 26. A wise man of the people shall inherit honour and his name standeth for ever. xx. 13. A wise man with a little uttereth his desire, and the goodness of the fool poureth away wisdom.

NOTES.

In these notes special attention is paid to the relation in which the Hebrew text stands to the Syriac, with which it is in close agreement, and by means of which the meaning of the Hebrew is made more clear than by the assistance of the Greek. The Syriac is published here in the form of an interlinear arrangement in order to bring out in many cases the absolute agreement. The Syriac text is disfigured by many glosses and interpolations; a double translation has sometimes been introduced from the margin into the text, and in a few instances the order of the verses and of the hemistichs has been displaced. I have merely rearranged here and

there a word or changed the order in which the verse is standing in the Syriac. It will then be seen how close the relation is, in which the two texts stand to one another.

xviii. 31. שׁוֹנֵא Hebrew and Syriac: singular. Greek: plural.

ver. 32. I have translated שֶׁמֶץ in accordance with all the versions, "much." The Hebrew word occurs only twice in Job (iv. 12 and xxvi. 14), in both cases translated by the Targum: קָצַת "little." The talmudic use of the word agrees on the whole with the idea of "little." The author of the Hebrew text of Ben Sira following his usual custom, selecting scarce words of the Bible and hapax legomena, has hit upon this word, and has given it a different meaning. He surely could not inveigh against a "little" rejoicing and pleasure; it is the surfeit of enjoyment which he reproves, which alone would bring poverty in its train. (32 b) The Syriac תְּרִין חֵד means "tandem aliquando," inadequately represented by the Hebrew פִּי שְׁנַיִם which can only mean "double," and occurs only twice in the Bible: 2 Kings ii. 9 and Zech. xiii. 8. G. is totally different from the Hebrew and Syriac; it reads: "neither be tied to the expense thereof." Ryssel tries to correct the Greek text, and he translates: "so that thy requirements be not in the long run double as great." If we detach the first words of the following verse in the Greek and attach them to the preceding, we find there also the allusion to "not getting poor," which in the Greek as it stands is taken to be part of ver. 33. But it makes there no sense whatsoever. For what can mean: "Be not made a beggar by banqueting upon borrowing, when thou hast nothing in thy purse." If a man "has nothing in the purse" he evidently *is* already a "beggar," and cannot *become* after banqueting on borrowed money! The fact is that we must read the Greek (as the Syriac), "lest through double expenses thou necessarily wilt become a beggar." The Hebrew word רִישׁוֹ occurs only twice in the Bible—Prov. xiii. 18 and xxviii. 19; translated in each case in the Targum by מִסְכִּינוּתָא.

ver. 33. In the Syriac I have eliminated the word מִסְכִּין as it is either due to a dittography, a senseless repetition of the concluding word of the last verse, or a correction made from the Greek. The former seems to be the more correct view. The parallelism between the Syriac and the Hebrew is now perfect. The Hebrew expression וּלֹל וְסוּבָא occurs twice in the Bible in this connexion—Deut. xxi. 20 and Prov. xxiii. 21; cf. also ver. 20. The reference to the passage in Proverbs assists us in explaining the difference between the Syriac and the Hebrew of our Text in the following verse (xix. 1). Instead of זֶאת the pronoun, the Syriac has in the first hemistich the noun from the preceding verse רִישׁוֹ and adds the second noun, represented

by the synonymous expression, רָחַם בִּשְׂרָא, following the example in Prov. xxiii. 20, where the Hebrew has וּלְלִי בִשֶׁר, and the Peshitto adds the word בִּשֶׁר also in ver. 21.

The Greek of xix. 1 a reads like a wrong translation from the Syriac: "A labouring man that is given to drunkenness." H. 1 b agrees better with G. "and he that contemneth small things." I have completed the last word to read יִתְעַרֵּר. The noun occurs in Ps. cii. 18, where the Peshitto translates צְלוֹתָא רְמַסְכִּינָא. The verb occurs Jer. li. 58 עָרַץ תִּתְעַרֵּץ, but it is translated by all: "uprooted, destroyed, utterly broken." In his usual way the author of this Hebrew Ben Sira selects the hapax legomena and scarce words. It can have here no other meaning than in Psalm cii: "utterly impoverished." The Syriac has נִאֲרַת מִסְכְּנִיתָא "to inherit poverty." G. has: "shall fall little by little."

ver. 2 a. H. agrees absolutely with S., nay the very same words are used in both, as I felt justified in completing the verb יִפְחוּז, corresponding in meaning and form to the Syriac מִפְחוּזִין. This verb is used more than once by the Hebrew B-S., v. the Glossary to Neubauer-Cowley's edition, s.v. פָּחוּז, where reference is made to this verse, with the hope that it may have been used. This expectation has now been fulfilled by the discovery of the Hebrew of this verse. G. totally different. לֵב is taken as "men of understanding," and the verb rendered by me "defile" or "make wanton" is rendered by G. "to fall away"; Ryssel adds "from God." He has also misunderstood the Syriac of ver. 1 b, and still more the following part of this verse. I omit here the second half of Syriac, i. e. 2 b, as it is not found in the Hebrew, and what is numbered as Syriac 3 is taken by me to be the true 2 b. A glance at the Greek and at the Commentaries of Edersheim and Ryssel will convince every one that this passage is corrupted more than in the Syriac, though this has also suffered by the intercalation of 2 b, a mere repetition of 2 a. Ryssel considers ver. 3 S. as a late interpolation. In the light of the Hebrew text we must reverse this opinion and reject 2 b as a late interpolation. Ver. 3 S. corresponds exactly to H. 2 b, word for word. The Hebrew עוֹז has been rendered by me "bold, impudent" as in Prov. עוֹזִים impudence, roughness, not "strong." In G. 3 b seems to offer an analogy to this part of the verse. If we omit in G. 2 b and 3 a, and join 3 b to 2 a we shall have corrected the text in a much more satisfactory manner than has been done by Ryssel and others.

xx. 5. Agrees with both versions, S. and G. Ryssel's suggestion that in the Hebrew stood נִמְצָא, for which G. "found." The Hebrew here, however, is נִחְשָׁב "considered," exactly as the Syriac. 5 ב רִיב must evidently be read בְּרִיב. I have translated accordingly.

ver. 6. Missing in S., agrees in the main with G. עת here and in the following verses is used in the same sense as in Eccles. iii. 1 ff., "propitious, proper time." In S. and G. 7 a the word is rendered "opportunity."

ver. 7 a. H. agrees more with G. than with S. which has נטר in both halves of the verse. Both versions have "נברא" or "man" in connexion with "wise," but in all the following verses it is omitted regularly. So throughout in the Hebrew, which has only חכם. 7 b. S. and G. have an addition (due to a marginal gloss) "wicked" S., and "babblers" G., beside the "fool" which alone is found in H. Ryssel observes that the true antithesis between ver. 8 (or 7) is ver. 13. The intermediary would thus appear to be in a wrong place altogether. Instead then of verses 9-12 found in G. and S. we have in our text the verses which are now in G. and S. in chapter xxxii. I have already pointed out above the relation in which the Hebrew stands to the other versions. I mention that these new verses have been edited twice, once by Mr. Margoliouth in the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, and a second time by Mr. J. Lévi. Our present text agrees in the main more closely with B (the text of Mr. Margoliouth) than with C (Lévi). But as the comparison has not been made with the exactly corresponding verses in S, I must, however briefly, go over the same ground once more.

xxxvii. 19. H. has the peculiar Aramaic form נחכם, whilst in ver. 22 it is the Hebrew form יחכם. The parallelism between H. and S. becomes evident the moment we recognize in S. a displacement of the second hemistichs in each of the two verses, now S. 20 and 22. Written in parallel columns one over the other, they have changed places; 22 b ought now to be what it probably was at the beginning viz. 20 b, and the latter ought to take its proper place after 22 a. לרבים is represented in S. by "at all times," "at many times," and not "for many men." H. agrees with S. "נחכם = חכים being "wise"; G. has instead "teacheth."

Our text has נואל like B, against C נואל. The first appears to be the more correct form. It is to be taken as identical with the same word meaning "pollution, defilement, unworthiness," just as Nehem. xiii. 29 and other passages in the Bible. It thus corresponds much better with the Greek "useless," "unprofitable," for נואל would have been rendered "foolishly." S. has "omnique honore privet seipsum." The Arabic translation, which rests upon the Syriac, "suumque deiciat honorem" (Walton's *Polyglott*). Surely no more perfect equivalent could be found for the Hebrew or vice versa in H., for it means in all instances "he becomes unworthy."

ver. 22. B and C have ייש like S. לנפשו in all these verses must be

taken as "himself," the personif. of the wise. גִּיתו in the same verse corresponds to S. "vultus aspectu," "the outward appearance," the "countenance"; "ab eiusdem vultu" Arab. (Walton) in contradistinction to "נִפְשׁוֹ." C has here also נִחְכֵּם, not so B. "The fruit of his understanding," H., agrees better with G. than with S. I have completed the word in accordance with the other MSS. into דַּעְתּוֹ.

ver. 24. This verse is a logical sequence to ver. 22. Those who are able to recognize the wise from his aspect, are praising him. H. agrees with S. and not with G., which is totally different from H. 24 a, whilst H. corresponds to S. word for word. The order of words of 24 b is reversed in C, agreeing even in that detail with S. In our text the order is somewhat different. In B this part is missing through imperfection of the MS. The verb יִשְׁרְחוּ is in plur. as conjectured by Mr. Lévi. Ryssel misunderstands here also the passage, and Lévi, not comparing the corresponding verses of S., comes to most curious conclusions.

ver. 26. H. like S. combines "the wise man" with "the people," and agrees also in the remaining portion closely. G. different. "Honour" adopted by Ryssel is found here also, and in S. Cod. 248 reads ἔσται, exactly as our text has עֹמֵד, and so S. I have added the word "בה" in conformity with the other text (C), but the true reading ought to be לְחַי. S. has also a similar form לְחַיָּא.

xx. 13. No S. for this verse. This verse as it stands does not agree with any version. I have tried to translate דָּבָר not as a noun, but as a verb: identical with the sentence in Micah vii. 3: וְהִגִּיד לְדָבָר הוּא: נִפְשׁוֹ "and the great man uttereth his mischievous desire," or "the desire of his soul." It would then mean here: "The wise man is able to utter his desire in a few words, whilst the goodness of the fool poureth away wisdom like water."

Thus far this new fragment. I draw no conclusions. The close agreement between this text and S. needs no further pointing out. Nor is it necessary to urge again the fact that text and writing exhibit a very archaic character. The relation between this text and the fuller Ben Sira still requires careful study. The problem as it presents itself to me is to determine in the first instance the claim of priority of one over the other, that is, to ascertain whether the smaller depends upon the larger book, or whether the larger is a later amplification of an older, smaller text. After this question has been satisfactorily

disposed of, it will then be time to open the question of the authenticity of this Hebrew text. It will be the duty of those who defend the authenticity to explain the surprisingly close and almost literal agreement with the Syriac, which goes so far as to obliterate the Hebrew character of this book, notably in its Syntax.

Among the fragments from the Genizah I have found a small portion of a leaf, in a very bad state of preservation. The writing, which is almost faint, is of a mixed character, uncial letters alternating with cursive. Fol. a has six lines visible, of which five are tolerably legible, though torn in the middle, and much mutilated at the left side. The reverse is in a worse condition, and only stray words can still be seen. As the text seems to stand in some relation to Sira, one or two maxims finding parallels in the latter, I am publishing them also, to preserve them from utter destruction. They are rhymed maxims, and resemble somewhat the collection published by Prof. Schechter, *J. Q. R.*, pp. 459-460.

שמע בני והתבונן והתחזק במוסר: [אח]וך שמע . . . [אש] . . .
 ושים כבוד לב[ראי]ך . ואל תקוץ במוסר: הותר וגם נאסר . . .
 ותן תודה וגם [י]ר[אה] אש[ר] בהם תיוסר: ב . . .
 ולא תשב מקום רבים [וחבר] . . . כל שר: לא . . .
 בני כי טוב יא[מר] לך עלה ה . . . לא תוסר . . .

שמעה [ה]אלים [נ]אנשים

ולא עין דמעות

תמים עת לבושה

יק . .

ולא רוא[ה] ולא [ת]שכן

M. GASTER.